



Handwritten initials: JFW, AF, and a signature.

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:	§	
John W. Carbone et al.	§	Group Art Unit: 3627
	§	
Serial No.: 10/064,665	§	Confirmation No.: 5321
	§	
Filed: August 5, 2002	§	Examiner: Sheikh, Asfand M.
	§	
For: System and Method for Providing	§	Atty. Docket: GERD:0778/YOD/FAR
Asset Management and Tracking	§	(126726-1)
Capabilities	§	

Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION OR MAILING 37 C.F.R. 1.8	
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted by facsimile to the United States Patent and Trademark Office in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.6(d), or is being transmitted via the Office electronic filing system in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.6(a)(4), or is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service with sufficient postage as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on the date below:	
September 22, 2008 Date	<i>Floron C. Faries</i> Floron C. Faries

APPEAL BRIEF PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. §§ 41.31 AND 41.37

This Appeal Brief is being filed in furtherance to the Notice of Appeal mailed on July 21, 2008, and received by the Patent Office on July 21, 2008.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge the requisite fee of \$510.00, and any additional fees which may be required, to Deposit Account No. 07-0868; Order No. GERD:0778/YOD (126726-1). However, if for any reason this charge fails, the Commissioner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 06-1315; Order No. GERD:0778/YOD (126726-1).

09/25/2008 WABDELRI 00000048 061315 10064665
01 FC:1402 510.00 DA

1. **REAL PARTY IN INTEREST**

The real party in interest is General Electric Company, the Assignee of the above-referenced application by virtue of the Assignment to General Electric Company, a subsidiary of General Electric Company, recorded at reel 013292, frame 0082, and dated September 12, 2002. Accordingly, General Electric Company, as the parent company of the Assignee of the above-referenced application, will be directly affected by the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

2. **RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

Appellants are unaware of any other appeals or interferences related to this Appeal. The undersigned is Appellants' legal representative in this Appeal.

3. **STATUS OF CLAIMS**

Claims 1-50 are currently pending, are currently under final rejection and, thus, are the subject of this Appeal.

4. **STATUS OF AMENDMENTS**

As the instant claims have not been amended at any time, there are no outstanding amendments to be considered by the Board.

5. **SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER**

The present invention relates generally to systems and methods for managing flow of physical assets between various entities. Application, page 1, lines 12 and 13 (first two lines of para. 1). More particularly, the present invention relates to methods and systems which utilize various computer technologies to create and maintain an up-to-date record of asset status and location information which may then be shared among various personnel. Page 1, lines 13-16. The Application contains two independent claims, namely, claims 1 and 26, both of which are the subject of this Appeal. The subject matter of these claims is summarized below. The subject matter of dependent claims 3-5 is also summarized.

Independent claim 1 recites a system (e.g., 100, 200) for enabling enhanced asset management and tracking capabilities, including: a plurality of electronic asset identification devices (e.g., 212), wherein each of the plurality of electronic asset identification devices is affixed to an asset (e.g., 214) whose location and information are to be managed, wherein each of the plurality of asset identification devices includes at least unique identification information relating to the asset to which it is affixed; an asset management server computer system (e.g., 102) for maintaining at least one database containing information regarding the asset identification devices and the assets to which they are affixed; a remote client computer system (e.g., 104) operatively connected to the asset management server computer system for exchanging information over a computer network; and at least one interrogation device (e.g., 106) operatively connected to the remote client computer system, wherein the at least one interrogation device is separate from the remote client computer system and receives information from the plurality of asset identification devices and exchanges said information with the remote client computer system. *See, e.g.,* Application, page 6, line 14 – page 12, line 18; Figures 1 and 2.

Independent claim 26 recites a method for enabling enhanced asset management and tracking capabilities, including: affixing a plurality of electronic asset identification devices (e.g., 212) to an asset (e.g., 214) whose location and information are to be managed; programming each of the plurality of asset identification devices to include at least unique identification information relating to the asset to which it is affixed; maintaining at least one database containing information regarding the asset identification devices and the assets to which they are affixed on an asset management server computer system (e.g., 102); operatively connecting a remote client computer system (e.g., 104) to the asset management server computer system for exchanging information over a computer network; and operatively connecting at least one interrogation device (e.g., 106) to the remote client computer system, wherein the at least one interrogation device is separate from the remote client computer system and receives information from the plurality of asset identification devices and exchanges said information with the remote

client computer system. *See, e.g.*, Application, page 6, line 14 – page 12, line 18; Figures 1 and 2.

Dependent claim 2 recites wherein the plurality of electronic asset management devices (e.g., 212) include radio frequency identification tags. *See, e.g.*, Application, page 14, lines 19-22; Figure 2. Dependent claim 3 recites wherein the at least one interrogation device (e.g., 106, 226) includes a fixed radio frequency identification tag reader. *See, e.g.*, Application, page 8, lines 1-15; page 16, line 17 – page 17, line 7; Figures 1 and 2. Dependent claim 4 recites wherein the at least one interrogation device (e.g., 106, 226) includes a handheld radio frequency identification tag reader. *See, e.g., id.* Dependent claim 5 recites wherein the handheld radio frequency identification tag reader (e.g., 106, 228) is a handheld computing device. *See, e.g., id.*

Dependent claim 7 recites at least one legacy database system (e.g., legacy databases 209) operatively connected to the asset management server computer system, for enabling exchange of legacy information relating to the assets to be managed. *See, e.g.*, Application, page 14, lines 9-14.

6. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

First Ground of Rejection for Review on Appeal:

Appellants respectfully urge the Board to review and reverse the Examiner's first ground of rejection in which the Examiner rejected claims 1-6, 16-17, 20, 24, 26-31, 41-42, 45, and 49 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marsh (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0023517, hereinafter "Marsh") in view of Maltseff (U.S. Publication No. 2002/00997282, hereinafter "Maltseff").

Second Ground of Rejection for Review on Appeal:

Appellants respectfully urge the Board to review and reverse the Examiner's second ground of rejection in which the Examiner rejected claims 7, 15, 32, and 40 under

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marsh in view of Maltseff as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Examiner's Official Notice.

Third Ground of Rejection for Review on Appeal:

Appellants respectfully urge the Board to review and reverse the Examiner's third ground of rejection in which the Examiner rejected claims 8 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marsh in view of Maltseff as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Bonham et al. (US Publication No. 2002/00997282, hereinafter "Bonham").

Fourth Ground of Rejection for Review on Appeal:

Appellants respectfully urge the Board to review and reverse the Examiner's fourth ground of rejection in which the Examiner rejected claims 9-10, 14, 34-35, and 39 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marsh in view of Maltseff and Bothman as applied to claim 8 and 33 above, and in further view of Ahlberg et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,587,836, hereinafter "Ahlberg").

Fifth Ground of Rejection for Review on Appeal:

Appellants respectfully urge the Board to review and reverse the Examiner's fifth ground of rejection in which the Examiner rejected claims 11-13 and 36-38 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marsh in view of Maltseff, Bothman, and Ahlberg as applied to claim 10 and 35 above, and further in view of Fleskes (U.S. Patent No. 6,529,910, hereinafter "Fleskes").

Sixth Ground of Rejection for Review on Appeal:

Appellants respectfully urge the Board to review and reverse the Examiner's sixth ground of rejection in which the Examiner rejected claims 18-19 and 43-44 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marsh in view of Maltseff as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Ahlberg.

Seventh Ground of Rejection for Review on Appeal:

Appellants respectfully urge the Board to review and reverse the Examiner's seventh ground of rejection in which the Examiner rejected claims 21, 23, 46, and 48 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marsh in view of Maltseff as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Cannon, Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,689,238, hereinafter "Cannon").

Eighth Ground of Rejection for Review on Appeal:

Appellants respectfully urge the Board to review and reverse the Examiner's eighth ground of rejection in which the Examiner rejected claims 22 and 47 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marsh in view of Maltseff.

Ninth Ground of Rejection for Review on Appeal:

Appellants respectfully urge the Board to review and reverse the Examiner's ninth ground of rejection in which the Examiner rejected claims 25 and 50 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mash in view of Maltseff as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Radican (U.S. Patent No. 6,148,291, hereinafter "Radican").

7. **ARGUMENT**

As discussed in detail below, the Examiner has improperly rejected the pending claims. Further, the Examiner has misapplied long-standing and binding legal precedents and principles in rejecting the claims under Section 103. Accordingly, Appellants respectfully request full and favorable consideration by the Board, as Appellants strongly believe that claims 1-50 are currently in condition for allowance.

A. **Ground of Rejection No. 1:**

The Examiner rejected claims 1-6, 16-17, 20, 24, 26-31, 41-42, 45, and 49 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marsh in view of Maltseff (U.S. Publication No. 2002/00997282, hereinafter "Maltseff"). Appellants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Legal Precedent

The burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103 falls on the Examiner. *Ex parte Wolters and Kuypers*, 214 U.S.P.Q. 735 (PTO Bd. App. 1979). To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the Examiner must show that the combination includes *all* of the claimed elements, *and* also a convincing line of reason as to why one of ordinary skill in the art would have found the claimed invention to have been obvious in light of the teachings of the references. *Ex parte Clapp*, 227 U.S.P.Q. 972 (B.P.A.I. 1985).

Deficiencies of the Rejection

The Examiner rejected the only two independent claims 1 and 26 based on the combination of Marsh and Maltseff. Claims 1 and 26 claims recite both a “remote client computer” and “at least one interrogation device” operatively connected to the remote client computer system, “wherein the at least one interrogation device is separate from the remote client computer system.” (Emphasis added).

Applicants initially stress that the cited combination does not teach or suggest all of the elements of claims 1 and 26. For example, the cited combination does not disclose a remote client computer, as claimed. Marsh discloses a field control device 110 and Maltseff discloses a personal computer 20. Neither reference indicates that such devices are a remote client computer. For this reason alone, the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Accordingly, the foregoing rejection should be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Further, Applicants believe there is no appropriate reason to modify Marsh to separate or add to the Marsh components, as apparently proposed by the Examiner. *See*,

e.g., Final Office Action, page 5. The Examiner contended that the Marsh field control device 110 reads on both elements of the present claims of a “remote client computer” and “at least one interrogation device.” Yet, the Marsh field control device 110 is a “computing device [a hand-held computing device] advantageously connected to a transmission device [an antenna].” See Marsh, paragraph 21. An antenna cannot be characterized as an interrogation device, as claimed. Further, the computing device 110, even if modified, cannot be characterized as separate devices of a client computer and an interrogation device, as claimed. Thus, the foregoing rejection is deficient for at least these reasons and the present claims should be allowed.

It should be emphasized that present claims recite both a *remote client computer* and an *interrogation device*, of which these devices are separate from one another. In contrast, again, the Marsh field control device 110 is a *single* device. To be sure, the device 110 which is a hand-held computing device connected to an antenna cannot be characterized as both a remote client computer and an interrogation device which are separate from each other, even if the Marsh device 110 is modified to separate the antenna from the computing device, and even if this modification of Marsh was appropriate.

The Examiner relied on the secondary reference (Maltseff) to modify the Marsh system to apparently split the Marsh computing and transmission device, and to have this split device read on both the *remote client computer* and the *interrogation device* of the present claims. First, the “transmission device” (an antennae) of Marsh, is said to be “advantageously connected” to the computing device. To be sure, the Examiner has not explained the feasibility of such a modification of Marsh, or why one of ordinary skill in the art would go against the teachings of Marsh to separate these two components of the Marsh field device 110. A prior art reference must be considered in its entirety, i.e., as a whole, including portions that would lead away from the claimed invention. *W.L. Gore & Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1540, 220 USPQ 303 (Fed. Cir. 1983), *cert. denied*, 469 U.S. 851 (1984).

Second, one of ordinary skill in the art would not add the unnecessary component of a remote client computer to the Marsh system to be coupled to Marsh computing device or to the antenna. Likewise, the skilled artisan would not add an interrogation device to be added to the Marsh system to be coupled to Marsh computing device or to the antenna. Such a hypothetical remote client computer and/or interrogation device in the Marsh system would not advance any purpose of the Marsh system, and would add unnecessary expense and complexity.

In conclusion, the Examiner relied on the Marsh and the secondary reference (Maltseff) to teach a field control device operatively connected to an asset management system and further the remote client computer system contains at least one interrogation device that is separate from the remote client computer. See Final Office Action, page 5. However, the Examiner provided no reasonable explanation or appropriate reason to modify Marsh. The Supreme Court has recently stated that the obviousness analysis should be explicit. See *KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.*, 82 U.S.P.Q.2d 1385 (U.S. 2007) (“[R]ejections based on obviousness grounds cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness.”) (quoting *In re Kahn*, 441 F.3d 977,988 (Fed. Cir. 2006)). In the present rejection, the Examiner has failed to meet this requirement of the obviousness analysis, and therefore has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness. Further, Appellants strongly believe that that there is not an appropriate reason to modify Marsh in such a way as to read on independent claims 1 and 26. For these reasons, Appellants respectfully request the Board direct the Examiner withdraw the rejection and allow the claims.

In the Advisory Action, the Examiner stated that the motivation for the combination was in order to allow for tracking information via a wireless memory device and storing the information as a central computer system. Appellants respectfully disagree that such motivation exists. First, Appellants respectfully assert that the

Examiner's analysis is conclusory and confusing. Second, Marsh already teaches a wireless memory device: the computing system (e.g., a PDA) of the field control device 110. See Marsh, paragraph 0021. Third, Marsh teaches away from storing information on a central computing system. See, e.g., Marsh, Abstract and paragraph 0007.

Dependent Claims

Dependent claim 3 recites wherein the at least one interrogation device includes a fixed radio frequency identification tag reader. Dependent claim 4 recites wherein the at least one interrogation device includes a handheld radio frequency identification tag reader. Lastly, dependent claim 4 recites wherein the handheld radio frequency identification tag reader is a handheld computing device. Conversely, Appellants believe it inappropriate to modify Marsh such that the Marsh transmission device is one of the devices recited in claims 2-4. After all, such a device is not needed in the Marsh system. It would not make sense to have both the Marsh computing device and a radio frequency identification tag reader. Likewise, it would not make sense to replace the Marsh computing device with a radio identification tag reader and to have a separate transmission device or antenna. There is simply no appropriate reason to have both a separate computing device (or remote client computer, as claimed) and a separate radio frequency identification tag reader, as claimed. Thus, for these additional reasons, the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness with regard to dependent claims 3-5. Accordingly, dependent claims 3-5 are patentable over the cited combination for these additional reasons, and the claims should be allowed.

B. Ground of Rejection No. 2:

The Examiner rejected claims 7, 15, 32, and 40 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marsh in view of Maltseff as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Examiner's Official Notice. Appellants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Examiner's use of Official Notice does not obviate the deficiencies of the cited combination of Marsh and Maltseff with regard to the independent claims discussed above. Therefore, the dependent claims 7, 15, 32, and 40 are believed to be patentable for at least the reason of their dependency on an allowable base claim. Accordingly, Appellants respectfully request the Board direct the Examiner to withdraw the rejection and allow the claims.

Further, claim 7 recites "at least one *legacy database system* operatively connected to the asset management server computer system." (Emphasis added). The cited combination is absolutely devoid of this feature. In addition, the Examiner's use of Official Notice is improper. Indeed, the Examiner has not reasonably argued or provided evidence to support his assertions of "well-known" facts which must be of a "notorious character" and "capable of such instant and unquestionable demonstration as to defy dispute." See M.P.E.P § 2144.03. Appellants believe that it not well-known to couple a legacy system into the Marsh system, in the manner asserted by the Examiner or in the manner recited in claim 7. For this additional reason, the Examiner has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness with regard to claim 7. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 7 should be withdrawn and claim 7 allowed.

C. **Ground of Rejection No. 3:**

The Examiner rejected claims 8 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marsh in view of Maltseff as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Bothman et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0101108, hereinafter "Bothman"). Appellants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Botham reference does not obviate the deficiencies of the cited combination of Marsh and Maltseff with regard to the independent claims discussed above. Therefore, the dependent claims 8 and 33 are believed to be patentable for at least the reason of their

dependency on an allowable base claim. Accordingly, Appellants respectfully request the Board direct the Examiner to withdraw the rejection and allow the claims.

D. **Ground of Rejection No. 4:**

The Examiner rejected claims 9-10, 14, 34-35, and 39 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marsh in view of Maltseff and Bothman as applied to claim 8 and 33 above, and further in view of Ahlberg et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,587,836, hereinafter “Ahlberg”). Appellants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Bothman and Ahlberg references do not obviate the deficiencies of the cited combination of Marsh and Maltseff with regard to the independent claims discussed above. Therefore, the dependent claims 9-10, 14, 34-35, and 39 are believed to be patentable for at least the reason of their dependency on an allowable base claim. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Board direct the Examiner to withdraw the rejection and allow the claims.

E. **Ground of Rejection No. 5:**

The Examiner rejected claims 11-13 and 36-38 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marsh in view of Maltseff, Bothman, and Ahlberg as applied to claim 10 and 35 above, and further in view of Fleskes (U.S. Patent No. 6,529,910, hereinafter “Fleskes”). Appellants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Bothman, Ahlberg, and Fleskes references do not obviate the deficiencies of the cited combination of Marsh and Maltseff with regard to the independent claims discussed above. Therefore, the dependent claims 11-13 and 36-38 are believed to be patentable for at least the reason of their dependency on an allowable base claim. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Board direct the Examiner to withdraw the rejection and allow the claims.

F. **Ground of Rejection No. 6:**

The Examiner rejected claims 18-19 and 43-44 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marsh in view of Maltseff as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Ahlberg. Appellants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Ahlberg reference does not obviate the deficiencies of the cited combination of Marsh and Maltseff with regard to the independent claims discussed above. Therefore, the dependent claims 18-19 and 43-44 are believed to be patentable for at least the reason of their dependency on an allowable base claim. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Board direct the Examiner to withdraw the rejection and allow the claims.

G. **Ground of Rejection No. 7:**

The Examiner rejected claims 21, 23, 46, and 48 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marsh in view of Maltseff as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Cannon, Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,689,238, hereinafter “Cannon”). Appellants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Cannon reference does not obviate the deficiencies of the cited combination of Marsh and Maltseff with regard to the independent claims discussed above. Therefore, the dependent claims 21, 23, 46, and 48 are believed to be patentable for at least the reason of their dependency on an allowable base claim. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Board direct the Examiner to withdraw the rejection and allow the claims.

H. **Ground of Rejection No. 8:**

The Examiner rejected claims 22 and 47 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marsh in view of Maltseff. Appellants respectfully traverse this rejection. The Examiner not obviate the deficiencies of the cited combination of Marsh and Maltseff with regard to the independent claims discussed above. Therefore, the

dependent claims 22 and 47 are believed to be patentable for at least the reason of their dependency on an allowable base claim. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Board direct the Examiner to withdraw the rejection and allow the claims.

I. **Ground of Rejection No. 8:**

The Examiner rejected claims 25 and 50 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mash in view of Maltseff as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Radican (U.S. Patent No. 6,148,291, hereinafter “Radican”). Appellants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Radican reference does not obviate the deficiencies of the cited combination of Marsh and Maltseff with regard to the independent claims discussed above. Therefore, the dependent claims 25 and 50 are believed to be patentable for at least the reason of their dependency on an allowable base claim. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Board direct the Examiner to withdraw the rejection and allow the claims.

Conclusion

Appellants respectfully submit that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. However, if the Examiner or Board wishes to resolve any other issues by way of a telephone conference, the Examiner or Board is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: September 22, 2008

Floron C. Faries
Reg. No. 59,991
FLETCHER YODER
P.O. Box 692289
Houston, TX 77269-2289
(281) 970-4545



8. **APPENDIX OF CLAIMS ON APPEAL**

1. A system for enabling enhanced asset management and tracking capabilities, comprising:

a plurality of electronic asset identification devices, wherein each of the plurality of electronic asset identification devices is affixed to an asset whose location and information are to be managed,

wherein each of the plurality of asset identification devices includes at least unique identification information relating to the asset to which it is affixed;

an asset management server computer system for maintaining at least one database containing information regarding the asset identification devices and the assets to which they are affixed;

a remote client computer system operatively connected to the asset management server computer system for exchanging information over a computer network; and

at least one interrogation device operatively connected to the remote client computer system,

wherein the at least one interrogation device is separate from the remote client computer system and receives information from the plurality of asset identification devices and exchanges said information with the remote client computer system.

2. The system of claim 1, wherein the plurality of electronic asset management devices include radio frequency identification tags.

3. The system of claim 2, wherein the at least one interrogation device includes a fixed radio frequency identification tag reader.

4. The system of claim 2, wherein the at least one interrogation device includes a handheld radio frequency identification tag reader.

5. The system of claim 4, wherein the handheld radio frequency identification tag reader is a handheld computing device.

6. The system of claim 5, wherein the remote client computer system is a handheld computing device.

7. The system of claim 1, further comprising:
at least one legacy database system operatively connected to the asset management server computer system, for enabling exchange of legacy information relating to the assets to be managed.

8. The system of claim 1, wherein the asset management server computer system further comprises:
at least one web application server computer system for serving a plurality of interactive web pages relating to the asset identification devices and the assets to which they are affixed.

9. The system of claim 8, further comprising:
at least one hypertext transfer protocol server computer system operatively connected to the web application server computer system; and
at least one authentication server computer system operatively connected to the hypertext transfer protocol server for performing authentication and logon services, wherein the authentication server computer system is further operatively connected to an LDAP directory system for facilitating user login and authentication,
wherein information exchanges initiated by the remote client computer system result in a first connection between the remote client computer system and the at least one authentication server computer system.

10. The system of claim 8, wherein the plurality of interactive web pages include:

- a home page;
- a login page for receiving user login information;
- a main menu page for displaying a plurality of options to users, selection of which a user to view and/or modify the asset management information maintained on the asset management web server computer system;
- a project details page for displaying general information regarding asset management information relating to a selected project;
- an asset search page for receiving asset search criteria from the user, the submission of which causes the asset management web server computer system to retrieve asset management information matching the submitted search criteria;
- an asset search results page for displaying the retrieved asset management information; and
- an asset details page for displaying specific asset management information relating to a selected one of the assets displayed on the asset search results page.

11. The system of claim 10, further comprising:

at least one authentication server computer system operatively connected to the web application server computer system for facilitating user login and authentication, wherein the web server application serves different web pages depending upon login information received from the remote client computer system.

12. The system of claim 11, wherein upon receipt of an administration level user, the plurality of interactive web pages further include:

a show report menu page for enabling users to select and create reports of available asset management information;

a synchronize web page for receiving file information for a file to be synchronized;

an asset receipt form web page for receiving a user indication regarding receipt of an asset;

an asset exception annotation web page for receiving information regarding an exception to be added to a selected asset;

an asset exception list page for displaying a listing of asset management exceptions associated with a selected project; and

a resolve asset exception web page, wherein users may indicate that a selected exception has been resolved.

13. The system of claim 11, wherein upon receipt of a material handling level user, the plurality of interactive web pages further include:

a synchronize web page for receiving file information for a file to be synchronized;

an asset receipt form web page for receiving a user indication regarding receipt of an asset;

an asset exception annotation web page for receiving information regarding an exception to be added to a selected asset;

an asset exception list page for displaying a listing of asset management exceptions associated with a selected project;

an asset storage maintenance details web page for displaying asset management information relating to the storage and maintenance of a selected asset;

an asset location form web page for displaying the physical location of a selected asset; and

an update asset location form web page for receiving updated asset location information for a selected asset.

14. The system of claim 8, further comprising:

at least one hypertext transfer protocol server computer system operatively connected to the web application server computer system; and

at least one authentication server computer system operatively connected to the hypertext transfer protocol server for performing authentication and logon services,

wherein the authentication server computer system is further operatively connected to an LDAP directory system for facilitating user login and authentication,

wherein information exchanges initiated by the remote client computer system result in a first connection between the remote client computer system and the at least one authentication server computer system.

15. The system of claim 1, wherein the remote client computer system is a laptop or notebook style computer system.

16. The system of claim 1, wherein information is synchronized between the at least one interrogation device and the remote client computer system, such that changes to the information made on the at least one interrogation device are translated to the information maintained on the remote client computer system.

17. The system of claim 16, wherein information is synchronized between the remote computer system and the asset management server computer system, such that changes to the information made on the remote client computer system are translated to the information maintained on the asset management server computer system.

18. The system of claim 1, further comprising additional remote client computer systems operatively connected to the asset management server computer system for enabling users to access and modify information contained on the asset management computer system.

19. The system of claim 18, wherein users operating the additional remote client computer systems are provided specialized access depending upon login information received by the asset management server computer system.

20. The system of claim 1, wherein the at least one interrogation device further comprises:

a computer software application resident thereon, wherein the computer software application incorporates one or more instructions for wirelessly determining the presence of a plurality of electronic asset identification devices.

21. The system of claim 20, wherein the computer software application further comprises:

one or more instructions for determining whether a selected electronic asset identification device is within a range of the interrogation device;

one or more instructions for indicating the presence of the selected electronic asset identification device to the user; and

one or more instructions for enhancing the indication of the presence of the selected electronic asset identification device upon increasing proximity to the selected electronic asset identification device.

22. The system of claim 20, wherein the computer software application further comprises:

one or more instructions for displaying asset management information regarding a selected asset, wherein the asset management information includes an indication regarding whether the selected asset has been confirmed; an indication that the selected asset has an electronic asset identification device affixed thereto; an indication regarding the presence of the affixed electronic asset identification; and an indication regarding the storage status of the selected asset.

23. The system of claim 20, wherein the computer software application further comprises:

one or more instructions for receiving an asset location area description;

one or more instructions for scanning the asset location area to identify the presence therein of electronic asset identification devices; and

one or more instructions for determining whether identified electronic asset identification devices correspond to information received from the asset management server computer system.

24. The system of claim 20, wherein the computer software application further comprises:

one or more instructions for synchronizing local information with asset management information received from the asset management server computer system for a selected group of assets.

25. The system of claim 20, wherein the computer software application further comprises:

one or more instructions for receiving a user confirmation that a selected asset has been received; and

one or more instructions for receiving exception information relating to the selected asset.

26. A method for enabling enhanced asset management and tracking capabilities, comprising:

affixing a plurality of electronic asset identification devices to an asset whose location and information are to be managed;

programming each of the plurality of asset identification devices to include at least unique identification information relating to the asset to which it is affixed;

maintaining at least one database containing information regarding the asset identification devices and the assets to which they are affixed on an asset management server computer system;

operatively connecting a remote client computer system to the asset management server computer system for exchanging information over a computer network; and

operatively connecting at least one interrogation device to the remote client computer system, wherein the at least one interrogation device is separate from the

remote client computer system and receives information from the plurality of asset identification devices and exchanges said information with the remote client computer system.

27. The method of claim 26, wherein the plurality of electronic asset management devices include radio frequency identification tags.

28. The method of claim 27, wherein the at least one interrogation device includes a fixed radio frequency identification tag reader.

29. The method of claim 27, wherein the at least one interrogation device includes a handheld radio frequency identification tag reader.

30. The method of claim 29, wherein the handheld radio frequency identification tag reader is a handheld computing device.

31. The method of claim 30, wherein the remote client computer system is a handheld computing device.

32. The method of claim 26, further comprising:
operatively connecting at least one legacy database system to the asset management server computer system, for enabling exchange of legacy information relating to the assets to be managed.

33. The method of claim 26, wherein the step maintaining at least one database on an asset management server computer system further comprises:
serving a plurality of interactive web pages relating to the asset identification devices and the assets to which they are affixed from at least one web application server computer system.

34. The method of claim 33, further comprising:
operatively connecting at least one hypertext transfer protocol server computer system to the web application server computer system; and
operatively connecting at least one authentication server computer system to the hypertext transfer protocol server for performing authentication and logon services, wherein the authentication server computer system is further operatively connected to an LDAP directory system for facilitating user login and authentication,
wherein information exchanges initiated by the remote client computer system result in a first connection between the remote client computer system and the at least one authentication server computer system.

35. The method of claim 33, wherein the step of serving a plurality of interactive web pages further comprises the steps of:
displaying a home page;
displaying a login page for receiving user login information;
displaying a main menu page for displaying a plurality of options to users, selection of which a user to view and/or modify the asset management information maintained on the asset management web server computer system;
displaying a project details page for displaying general information regarding asset management information relating to a selected project;
displaying an asset search page for receiving asset search criteria from the user, the submission of which causes the asset management web server computer system to retrieve asset management information matching the submitted search criteria;
displaying an asset search results page for displaying the retrieved asset management information; and
displaying an asset details page for displaying specific asset management information relating to a selected one of the assets displayed on the asset search results page.

36. The method of claim 35, further comprising:
operatively connection at least one authentication server computer system to the web application server computer system for facilitating user login and authentication, wherein the web server application serves different web pages depending upon login information received from the remote client computer system.

37. The method of claim 36, further comprising the steps of:
receiving administrative level user login information;;
displaying a show report menu page for enabling users to select and create reports of available asset management information;
displaying a synchronize web page for receiving file information for a file to be synchronized;
displaying an asset receipt form web page for receiving a user indication regarding receipt of an asset;
displaying an asset exception annotation web page for receiving information regarding an exception to be added to a selected asset;
displaying an asset exception list page for displaying a listing of asset management exceptions associated with a selected project; and
displaying a resolve asset exception web page, wherein users may indicate that a selected exception has been resolved.

38. The method of claim 36, further comprising the steps of:
receiving material handling level user login information;
displaying a synchronize web page for receiving file information for a file to be synchronized;
displaying an asset receipt form web page for receiving a user indication regarding receipt of an asset;
displaying an asset exception annotation web page for receiving information regarding an exception to be added to a selected asset;

displaying an asset exception list page for displaying a listing of asset management exceptions associated with a selected project;

displaying an asset storage maintenance details web page for displaying asset management information relating to the storage and maintenance of a selected asset;

displaying an asset location form web page for displaying the physical location of a selected asset; and

displaying an update asset location form web page for receiving updated asset location information for a selected asset.

39. The method of claim 33, further comprising:

operatively connecting at least one hypertext transfer protocol server computer system to the web application server computer system; and

operatively connecting at least one authentication server computer system to the hypertext transfer protocol server for performing authentication and logon services, wherein the authentication server computer system is further operatively connected to an LDAP directory system for facilitating user login and authentication,

wherein information exchanges initiated by the remote client computer system result in a first connection between the remote client computer system and the at least one authentication server computer system.

40. (The method of claim 26, wherein the remote client computer system is a laptop or notebook style computer system.

41. The method of claim 26, further comprising the step of:

synchronizing information between the at least one interrogation device and the remote client computer system, such that changes to the information made on the at least one interrogation device are translated to the information maintained on the remote client computer system.

42. The method of claim 41, further comprising the step of:
synchronizing information between the remote computer system and the asset management server computer system, such that changes to the information made on the remote client computer system are translated to the information maintained on the asset management server computer system.

43. The method of claim 26, further comprising the step of:
operatively connecting additional remote client computer systems to the asset management server computer system for enabling users to access and modify information contained on the asset management computer system.

44. (The method of claim 43, wherein users operating the additional remote client computer systems are provided specialized access depending upon login information received by the asset management server computer system.

45. The method of claim 26, further comprising the step of wirelessly determining, by a computer software application resident on the at least one interrogation device, the presence of a plurality of electronic asset identification devices.

46. The method of claim 45, wherein the computer software application further performs the steps of:
determining whether a selected electronic asset identification device is within a range of the interrogation device;
indicating the presence of the selected electronic asset identification device to the user; and
enhancing the indication of the presence of the selected electronic asset identification device upon increasing proximity to the selected electronic asset identification device.

47. The method of claim 45, wherein the computer software application further performs the step of:

displaying asset management information regarding a selected asset, wherein the asset management information includes an indication regarding whether the selected asset has been confirmed; an indication that the selected asset has an electronic asset identification device affixed thereto; an indication regarding the presence of the affixed electronic asset identification; and an indication regarding the storage status of the selected asset.

48. The method of claim 45, wherein the computer software application further performs the steps of:

receiving an asset location area description;

scanning the asset location area to identify the presence therein of electronic asset identification devices; and

determining whether identified electronic asset identification devices correspond to information received from the asset management server computer system.

49. The method of claim 45, wherein the computer software application further performs the step of:

synchronizing local information with asset management information received from the asset management server computer system for a selected group of assets.

50. The method of claim 45, wherein the computer software application further performs the steps of:

receiving a user confirmation that a selected asset has been received; and
receiving exception information relating to the selected asset.

9. **EVIDENCE APPENDIX**

None.

10. **RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX**

None.